

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS/ELECTION

Claims 1, 17, 19, 22, 31, and 33 are amended, claim 85 is newly added, and claim 16 is canceled. Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 17-22, 30-33, 35-51, 61-64, 66-73, and 81-85 are now pending in the application, although claims 9, 11, 17-21, 43, 44, 64, and 68 are withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected species. (Claims 12, 15, 23-29, 34, 52-60, 65, and 74-80 were previously canceled.) Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended.

Initially, Applicants note that the amendments to claims 17, 19, 31, and 33 were made to correct dependency errors or typographical errors and not for patentability reasons.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 33, 35-42, 45-51, 61-63, 66-69, and 81-84 contain allowable subject matter. As discussed below, Applicants believe that all pending claims contain allowable subject matter and are in condition for allowance. Applicants note that claims 43, 44, 64, and 68 are withdrawn as directed to a non-elected species but request that those claims be rejoined because of their dependency on allowed linking claim 41. (See MPEP § 809, pg. 800-48.)

Claims 1 and 33 were objected to. Applicants have amended both of those claims to address the Examiner's concerns and believe that the objections are overcome.

Claims 1-8, 10, 13, 14, 22-51, 61-63, 65-67, and 69-84 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,811,406. Applicants file herewith a terminal disclaimer, which should overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-8, 10, 13, 14, 30-32, 70-73 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,525,551 to Beaman et al. ("Beaman '551"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants express appreciation for the Examiner's indication that claim 1 would be allowable if amended to specify that the "contact element" is joined to more than one column element. Applicants have so amended claim 1, which should now be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-11, 13, 14, 17-21, 30-32, and 70-73 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also patentable. Applicants note that claims 9, 11, and 17-21 are withdrawn as directed to a non-elected invention but request that those claims be rejoined because of their dependency on now presumably allowable linking claim 1. (See MPEP § 809, pg. 800-48.)

Independent claim 22 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as anticipated by Beaman '551 and under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by US Patent No. 4,998,885 to Beaman ("Beaman '885"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The instant application claims priority to application serial no. 08/819,464 (hereinafter "the Parent"), which was filed March 17, 1997 and thus predates the filing date of Beaman '551. Figure 7F of the Parent (a divisional of which has been published as US Patent Application Publication 2003/0199179) fully supports claim 22. Specifically, element 730 in Figure 7F of the Parent provides an example of the column element of claim 22 of the instant application, and element 720 in Figure 7F provides an example of the contact element of claim 22.

Moreover, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action, the Parent application describes pedestal 730 of Figure 7F as comprising a wire stem. Referring to published PCT application PCT/US95/14909, the Parent, describes "'composite' interconnection elements" as comprising a "wire stem." (See paragraph [0027] of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0199179.) The Parent then states that "the pedestal (730)" may be "implemented as a 'composite interconnection element' (refer to the aforementioned PCT/US95/14909." (See paragraph [0197] of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0199179.) The Parent thus clearly discloses that pedestal 730 of Figure 7F may comprise a wire stem.

The Parent thus fully supports claim 22 of the instant application. Consequently, claim 22 is entitled to a filing date that predates Beaman '551, and Beaman '551 is not, therefore, prior art to claim 22.

Turning now to Beaman '885, that reference fails to disclose or suggest the cantilevered, elongate beam now recited in claim 22. That is, neither the ball shaped contact 50 of Beaman '885 nor any other part of Beaman '885 teaches or suggests "a cantilevered, elongate beam, a first portion of said beam joined to said top of said column element, and a second portion of said beam disposed away from said column element and free to deflect independent of said first portion," as recited in claim 22. Applicants note that Beaman '551 likewise fails to teach or suggest such a beam. Thus, neither Beaman '885 nor Beaman '551 teaches or suggests claim 22.

New claim 85 depends from claim 22 and is therefore also not rejectable in view of Beaman '551 or Beaman '885. Moreover, claim 85 recites additional features that clearly are not disclosed or taught by Beaman '551 or Beaman '885. Like the amendment for claim 1 suggested


by the Examiner, claim 85 states that the "beam is joined to . . . [a] plurality of column elements." Thus, Beaman '551 and Beaman '885 fail to teach or suggest claim 85.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants assert that all claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. If at any time the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 323-5934.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 14, 2005

By



N. Kenneth Burraston
Reg. No. 39,923

Kirton & McConkie
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
P.O. Box 45120
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-1004
Telephone: (801) 323-5934
Fax: (801) 321-4893